

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the non-final Office Action of December 14, 2005 requiring an election of invention as between Group I, having claims 1 to 8 and 11 to 32 and Group II, having claims 9 and 10, said to be distinct as a combination and a subcombination. A month was allotted for reply.

Though not specifically stated, it seems clear that the Preliminary Amendment presenting the pending claims 1 to 32 was before the examiner for consideration.

Response to Election Requirement

The Applicant, through its representatives and attorneys, hereby provisionally elects with traverse the invention of Group I, having claims 1 to 8 and 11 to 32. Further, the Applicant, without waiver of its right to present the subcombination subject matter of claims 9 and 10 in a divisional application as of right, further amends claim 9, on which claim 10 depends, to be dependent on claim 1. Thus, it is submitted that amended claims 9 and 10 act as linking claims.

The sole reason for the traverse is that an examination of the subject matter of claims 9 and 10, if standing alone, would present no significant burden for examination along with an examination of the elected claims.

Specification

The initial portion of the specification as previously amended is further amended to update the status of the parent application.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this

application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 28, 2005

By: 

Ronald P. Kananen, Registration No.; 24,104
Rader, Fishman & Grauer PLLC
Lion Building
1233 20th Street N.W., Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
CUSTOMER NO. 23353
(202) 955-3750
Attorney for Applicants

R0200908.DOC